UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

"No Schism in the Body"

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Gandhi and the Prohibition Movement in India

By TARAKNATH DAS

A Letter from Bulgaria

By P. M. MATTHIEFF

Concerning Latin America

By FREDERICK STARR

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 22

Chicago, August 18, 1921

PUBLISHED BI-WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Francis L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 339
"No Schism in the Body."—John Haynes Holmes 341

THE PULPIT—
The Coming Revolution in Religion.—Rev. V. T. Pomeroy 344

CONTRIBUTED—
Gandhi and the Prohibition Movement in India.—Tarak-nath Das 347
A Burial at Sunset.—J. T. Sunderland 347

CORRESPONDENCE—
A Letter from Bulgaria.—P. M. Matthieff 348
Marshal Foch on Napoleon.—David Starr Jordan 349

THE BOOK TABLE—
Concerning Latin America.—Frederick Starr 349

POETRY—
Let Me Enjoy.—*Thomas Hardy* 339
The Fireplace.—Charles Rice 343
For a Birthday.—A. A. O. 346
In the Street.—Marion Murdoch 347
Vagabonds.—James Waldo Fawcett 349

THE FIELD—
A New Idea of Church Unity 351
Japanese Office Girls Form a Union 351

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVII • THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 1921 NUMBER 22

LET ME ENJOY.

I.

Let me enjoy the earth no less
Because the all-enacting Might
That fashioned forth its loveliness
Had other aims than my delight.

II.

About my path their flits a Fair,
Who throws me not a word or sign;
I'll charm me with her ignoring air,
And laud those lips not meant for mine.

III.

From manuscripts of moving song
Inspired by scenes and souls unknown,
I'll pour out raptures that belong
To others, as they were my own.

IV.

And some day hence, toward Paradise,
And all its blest—if such should be—
I will lift glad, afar-off eyes,
Though it contain no place for me.

Time's Laughingstocks. —*Thomas Hardy.*

The editors of this paper denounced the Versailles Peace the very moment its terms were announced to the world. They urged the repudiation of this Peace by the United States, and rejoiced when the Senate refused to soil its hands with such an abomination. For this attitude of opposition we have been appropriately rebuked by some of our readers, especially for the so-called violence of our language. We have at times had qualms ourselves as to whether anything could be quite as bad as we thought and said that these treaties were. Now that we have read the recent address on the subject by Viscount Bryce at the Institute of Politics at Williamstown, we stand amazed at our own moderation! We know how temperate and restrained we are in the expression of opinion! The worst thing we ever said about the Versailles Conference was that it was the Congress of Vienna over again. Bryce now declares that it was much worse; for while, he says,

> the men of Vienna, Alexander and Metternich, Talleyrand, Hardenberg and Castlereagh, may have had bad principles and employed despotic weapons and misconceived the interests of their people, they at least knew what they were doing and gave effect to their principles. (Furthermore) their work bestowed upon Europe a tolerable peace which lasted for more than thirty years, but there is not one of the treaties of 1919-1920 which is not now already admitted to need amendment, while some are seen to lead straight to future wars.

Lord Bryce testifies that in Europe the work of the peace-makers "has received nothing but censure." Pointing out that "the negotiators at Paris differed in their principles and ideals," he intimates that "at least some of them do not seem to have believed in the principles they professed," and to have regarded "not what ought to be done, but also what would help in their next electoral campaigns." The difficulties involved were enormous, and called for "persons of the class which we now call supermen, persons who possessed . . . wide vision, a grasp of fundamental principles, a calm judgment raised above the revengeful passions of the moment, persons who loved and sought justice looking beyond the present to the future, seeking the good of mankind as well as the advantage of their respective nations. . . . Such men did not appear." Considering particular situations, Bryce declares that "there is no blacker cloud hanging over Europe than that which darkens the banks of the Rhine"; that "Italy had no historical title whatever to the purely Germanic region she sought to acquire," and that the quarter of a million of German Tyrolese "were delivered up to her as if they had been so many cattle," and that Turkey, after all her "crimes," was treated with "extraordinary lenity." To the defenders and apologists of the Versailles Peace, we commend this Williamstown address, for Viscount Bryce is a sober man.

Let's have this down in black and white, for future reference! Gen. Tasker Howard Bliss, of the United States Army, declared last spring, in his famous letter appealing for action by the churches in behalf of disarmament that in the event of another war, the Christian Church more than any other agency should be held responsible. Professor Kemper Fullerton of the Union Theological Seminary, in an address at the final session of the mid-summer conference of ministers in New York, endorsed this statement. "When a man like General Bliss speaks in this way," said the professor, "it shows that the writing has appeared on the wall." Very good! We shall keep this issue of UNITY carefully on file for use when that next war comes. For are the churches doing anything to meet this latent responsibility? Do they even realize what kind of action such stupendous responsibility involves? To our way of thinking, the situation calls for nothing less than a vast international conference of all churches in all countries, which shall solemnly pledge Christians in the name of God and Jesus Christ, (1) not to pay any taxes to any government which supports a separate and competitive army and navy, and (2) not to fight in any war under any circumstances, and which shall organize machinery in every country to educate people

to the acceptance of these pledges, and put them into effect. What we need is a church movement throughout the world, like Gandhi's movement in India, of "non-co-operation" with war-governments. This may seem startling—but what else is effectively consistent with Jesus' gospel? It undoubtedly means martyrdom—but when did Christians shrink from martyrdom in a great cause?

Who caused the Great War? Germany? Oh, no! The Allies? Wrong again! The only real culprits, according to a new anti-Semitic monthly which has appeared in London, are the Jews! Under the caption, "The Jew-Made War," a leading article proclaims

> that every day it is becoming more and more plain that the Great War was no more a German war than it was a Chinese war. It was a Jewish war. The Jews designed it and conducted it from both sides. The British army and navy were as much under the control of the Learned Elders of Zion as were the armies and navies of the Central Powers. Europe was a cock-pit, and the Jews put up all the cocks and made the books so that they should not lose whoever might win.

This is amazing information. It strikes us as the most amazing news since the great discovery that the Roman Catholic Church caused the war. Indeed, it is so amazing that we have to confess our weakness and say that we find it hard to believe. Much more accurate seems to us the statement of Dr. Francis E. Clark, founder and president of the Christian Endeavor Society:

> This last and greatest of wars, what is this but a repetition of the old, old story of trust in big battalions and big battleships and every instrument of war which the devilish ingenuity of man can devise, rather than the principles of the Prince of Peace?

What to do with the "movies"—is there any more urgent problem now before the American people? Here is a new art, compact of marvellous possibilities for the enrichment and ennobling of human life; and here it is captured by the commercial interests of the day, and prostituted to the idlest or basest uses of popular entertainment! The frank indecencies flaunted in the public eye by the "movies," which are just now attracting the widest attention and stirring the loudest protest, seem to us to constitute only a small part of the problem. Indecencies, even of the more subtle sort, can be counted upon to undo themselves in the long run. What is to us most serious in this business is that lowering of general standards of intelligence and emotion which is an inevitable consequence of the "movie" habit. Millions of people are today seeking no other form of diversion than that furnished by "the pictures," with the result that little by little they are being reduced to the level of the child or the mentally defective adult, who can understand nothing but a picture-book. To read a book or even a newspaper editorial, to follow the slow unfolding of a spoken drama, to respond to the sonorous music of Shakespeare's verse or Beethoven's harmonies, is becoming literally impossible for these millions. The "movies," as now indulged in by the masses, means the atrophy of every higher intellectual and emotional faculty of man; they mean the slow impoverishment of the soul. Nothing can save the situation but the rescue of the "movies" from the commercial field, and their deliberate sublimation to the plane of a new art, to be practiced, as other arts are practiced, as a medium not for money-making but for inward spiritual self-expression. Some few feeble signs of this development have appeared in the past, and for a fleeting moment a "movie-palace" has seemed to be transformed into an art gallery or a symphony hall. But these signs have gone almost as soon as they have come! It is not surprising that the situation is challenging attention; but it is sad that thus far no more constructive remedy has been suggested or applied than that of a censorship.

The movement among Catholics for the establishment of a Catholic daily newspaper in this country, seems to be growing. One writer on the subject (*America,* June 4), calls this proposition "more important than any other enterprise engaging the Catholic laity of America in these days." The idea seems to be, to acquire or establish a journal which shall be "issued strictly as a newspaper, not as a purveyor of pious writings, nor even as a purveyor of none but Catholic news." The excellent model of *The Christian Science Monitor* is here plainly in view! But curious notions appear as to the management of such a newspaper. Thus, "in the hands of a Catholic newspaperman," writes one ardent advocate, "the telegraph service acquired as part of the newspaper property would be far less objectionable than it is as handled by the secular press. *He would know what to cut out.*" This is pretty frank confession, but it is quite in line with all acknowledged standards of newspaperdom. The editors of our existing papers know also "what to cut out," *and* what to put in! Their standard of judgment, of course, is not that of the Catholic, but the principle involved is just the same. The average newspaper today is an out-and-out propaganda sheet. It presents to the public not what has happened in the world, but what its editors and owners think it wise that the public should imagine has happened. It seems to us only natural that the Catholics should desire to get into the game.

It is astonishing these days to read the religious journals of America and note the large amount of space devoted to the discussion of pre-millennialism. A recent student has declared that there is as much room given to this theological extravaganza as to the very important problem of church union. The revival of pre-millennialism is undoubtedly one of the spiritual

consequences of the Great War. We doubt, however, if it is just the kind of consequence which our church leaders had in mind in 1917 and 1918 when they were talking so much about the great things that the war was going to do for religion. At that time we gathered the impression from sermons and editorials that the European horror, in some strangely miraculous way, was destined to bring about the spiritual rejuvenation of mankind "in the twinkling of an eye." We have been waiting ever since the Armistice for evidences of this rejuvenation; but now that the conflagration is ended, we find in the dead cold ashes no pure gold at all, but only some black and rusty nails. Of these, pre-millennialism is the most conspicuous. What the war has done, in other words, in the religious world as in every other, is to throw man right straight back into the ages of barbarism. People are thinking and talking today just as they did in the Middle Ages. We suppose that this insanity, born of fear, despair and ignorance, must run its course, fading away only as the restoration of social order returns men's mind once again to some degree of sanity. But then, in all probability, there will come along another great war, to hurl us back into another period of Dark Ages; and when that hour comes, we suppose that we shall again find the pulpits of the churches noisy with the chattering of ecclesiastical parrots about war as an occasion of spiritual salvation. Was not Bernard Shaw right, as usual, when he said that men learn nothing from experience excepting the truth that men learn nothing from experience?

We have heard three great tenors in our day—Campanini, de Reszke, and Caruso, so recently dead in his beloved Italy. Of Campanini, we could make no judgment, as we listened to him when his voice was a wreck and himself a broken man. Of the other two, de Reszke was incomparably the greater artist, while Caruso had incomparably the greater voice. We have always felt that it was the greatness of the man behind the voice—greatness alike of intellect, sentiment and spirit—which made de Reszke for so many years the king of the lyric stage. With Caruso, on the other hand, it was the voice that made the man supreme among his fellows—a voice of such golden beauty as baffles all description. In his later years, to be sure, Caruso took on something of artistic stature by dint of much hard work and careful training; but to the end it was the marvellous voice that held audiences as in a magic spell. It is a tragedy that the master tenor should have died so young; the loss to the world in such an untimely death, is immeasurable! But he was spared such pathetic years of recurrent "farewells," with broken tones and compassionate applause, as ended Campanini's days, and such equally pathetic but infinitely wiser years of silence as have marked the close of de Reszke's great career. Caruso will be remembered always as in his prime; he will be forever visualized in the center of the Metropolitan stage, singing to ravished ears his "Celeste Aida." Voices as great, or even greater, may some day bless the world, but this generation will never hear his like again.

"No Schism in the Body"

We take for the text of this week's editorial discourse, a passage from an excellent article published in the *Continent* on May 12th last, entitled "Quit Bargaining—and Unite." Speaking of the scandal that the Presbyterian church in America is cut up into various sub-divisions, the writer makes a wider application of his appeal for unity, and says:

> When Protestant denominations grow tall enough to look out over the fields white for harvest and see their single, supreme and common duty in the quick reaping of those fields, then they will come together spontaneously, forgetful of bargaining, careless of human distinctions, fused into unity by one hot passion for Christ. It is quiet true that, even in that ideal day, men will still disagree in many questions of church constitution and doctrine, and so a certain amount of technical denominationalism may survive. But it will not be separative denominationalism. And certainly it will not respect, nor indeed tolerate, rival church divisions kept up for mere pride's sake.

This statement is of great general interest, as applied to the entire field of organized religion at this moment. It is of very particular interest, as applied to the specific program of reform which is being offered by the community church movement. This movement, among other things, is frankly and openly directed against the sectarian type of church organization. Its leaders contend that there is no reason why there should be such phenomena as denominations in religion—that there is certainly no reason why the denominations which were fashioned in the heat of the theological controversies of the 17th and 18th centuries, should survive into our own day. "Communitarians," as they are sometimes humorously called, declare that Christian unity is even now a present possibility, and offer the community life of our American democracy as the center around which may be organized "the one body" of a universal and all-inclusive religion.

Whenever this proposition is presented, however, there is always somebody who is sure to rise up and strenuously object that it is impossible to imagine that the time will ever come, much less concieve that it is already here, when all, or even many, men will agree on things religious. People have different ideas in religion as in every other field of human experience. It is no more possible, nor even desirable, that men should think alike in these great spiritual concerns, than that they should think alike in political and economic concerns. To hope for unity in religion, in the sense that denominations and competing churches will disappear, is really to hope not that men will agree, but that they will conform to some "mush of concession" which is as ignoble as it is

sterilizing. The real man will never consent to such surrender of virtue to expediency. Just to the extent that he understands the worth of the religious conciousness and reverences the truth, he will insist upon bearing witness to what he sees, joining himself gladly to others who see what he does, and seeking ardently to bring still others to his angle of vision. Denominationalism, after all, is not a monument to human intolerance and perversity; it means not an unworthy struggle and waste of spiritual forces. On the contrary, it is the natural and praiseworthy result of the soul's fidelity to itself. It is a tribute to, as well as an expression of, the priceless worth of individuality, and the joy of comradeship in the service of right ideas.

With all that is here implied of the august imperatives of truth, of the duty of a man to be true to himself and seek unfalteringly his own, we have no quarrel. What we object to is the assumption, first, that theological ideas as such are central to religion; and secondly, that fidelity to one's ideas is conditional on exclusive association with those who agree with oneself.

(1) The assumption that ideas constitute the heart of religion, to the extent at least of forming the unit of spiritual integration, is a part of our inheritance from the Protestant Reformation, and a highly disastrous part. It is a phase of that pestilential superstition that dogma is synonymous with truth, and theology with religion. So long as men actually believed, of course, that it was necessary to accept a certain type of faith in order to be saved, and believed also that to be saved was the be-all and end-all of religion, it was inevitable that the creed should hold the central place in the religious life. The moment also that men were freed from the tyranny of the medieval ecclesiastical hierarchy, and thus given opportunity and stimulus to express their own ideas and work out their own theological formulas of salvation, it was inevitable that they should organize churches to protect and propagate what was to them divine truth, and that these churches should be as numerous as the existing varieties of theological speculation. It was thus that the denominations of Protestantism sprang into existence. Each represented a teacher, a school of thought, a habit of mind. Especially did each embody a way of salvation which was alone guaranteed to be safe and sure. To flock about these banners of the true faith, to lift a new banner if no one of the old ones carried the right colors—this was the duty, in such an age, of every religious soul. To be religious, indeed, was to be a Lutheran, or a Presbyterian, or a Baptist, according to the point of view in each particular case. To accept a certain idea of God, to conform to a certain ritual of worship, to recognize the divine character of a certain type of ecclesiastical government—upon these weighty matters hung the issues of life and death, a clear conscience in this world and a soul redeemed in the world that is to come.

Just to state this origin of our Protestant denominations to-day, however, is to discredit them and prepare the way for their dissolution. For who is there who believes any more this theological theory of the religious life? Where is the man who is willing to argue that it makes any basic difference, from the spiritual point of view, whether a man is a Presbyterian or a Unitarian, a Protestant or a Jew, or a Christian or a non-Christian, provided only he be sincere and living up to the best and highest standards that he knows? Does not John Burroughs express the typical modern point of view, in his last book, "Accepting the Universe," when he says of the natural scientist that he has no need "of any formal, patent-right religion. Were not Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall, and Lyell, and all other seekers and verifiers of natural truth among the most truly religious men?" For we are coming to see to-day that religion is more than theology, as "the life is more than meat, and the body than raiment." Religion is life—it is the identification of the single soul with the universal spirit which animates the world. Theology is the attempt to understand and define this life, to bring this universal spirit within the range and measurement of the finite mind. Such attempt is interesting, important, fruitful, but to it religion can never be bound. For religion is the spirit, and

> The Spirit, overbrooding all,
> Eternal love remains.

Burroughs sums it all up, when he says:

> Theological grounds do not count with me. . . . The various man-made creeds are fictitious, like the constellations Orion, Cassiopeia's Chair, the Big Dipper; the only real thing in them is the stars, and the only real thing in the creeds is the soul's aspiration toward the Infinite. This abides, though creeds and dogmas change or vanish.

(2) But what about the obligation of truth—this very truth which John Burroughs tells us men like Darwin and Huxley "would have gone to hell for"? If a certain theology seems to me to be the truth, so help me God, shall I not cling to it, defend it, advocate it, and above all commend it unto others? Indeed, yes! But here is the point! To serve what seems to me to be the truth, in unbroken spiritual comradeship with other men, is one thing; to serve this truth by severing human comradeship with other men, and setting up a sect, or separate exclusive church of any kind, is another and very different thing. The trouble in religion has been that men have insisted that the love of truth must divide humanity, that it is essentially inconsistent with unity of spirit and ideal. In the scientific world, of course, this is not so. Inside of one all-inclusive scientific society, royal or otherwise, live and work savants of every variety of thought and speculation. They differ endlessly among themselves, they argue and de-

bate and challenge, they organize groups to advance one doctrine and confute another; but they maintain unbroken the common society of which they are all members together. There is "no schism in (their) body"—sectarianism is impossible in the scientific world. For the love of truth, in which they all share together, is greater than devotion to any one particular formulation of that truth. So also in the social or political field! Here we are all citizens of one great country. Does this mean that we all think alike in matters pertaining to the theories and ideals of government? Do we maintain "one union indivisible" by indulging in "a mush of concession" in our ideas? On the contrary—we free citizens of free America are many men of many minds. Some of us are Republicans, some Democrats, some Socialists. Every now and then new groups appear, like the Greenbackers and the Progressives. But these differences of political opinion do not tend in any way to divide the nation. Republicans or Democrats do not undertake to secede from America, and thus to match the scandal of a divided church with the scandal of a divided state. In spite of our conflicting ideas, and our organization for certain definite purposes about these ideas, we find it not only possible but pleasant to live and work together as members of one common political household. When we hold patriotic meetings (i. e.—the religious services of the state), we ignore all claims of partisanship. First and foremost, we are Americans; love of country transcends and dominates within our hearts all love of party.

Devotion to truth, therefore, in other fields of action, is by no means inconsistent with the inclusive life. Why should it act otherwise in religion? For what reason, indeed, if not the fact already commented upon, that in religion dogma has usurped the place of spirit—by which we mean that some particular brand of truth has become confused with truth itself? We would never be divided up, in the religious world, into a hundred and one preposterous denominations, if we were interested in God and not in some doctrine about God, concerned with love and not with some theory of love, devoted to the law of Christ and not to some dogma of the person of Christ. We are beset by the theological mind, and therewith have been led astray from the religious spirit. We are Presbyterians or Universalists first, and not Christians; as though a scientist were a materialist or a vitalist first, and not a naturalist, or a citizen of this country a Republican or Democrat first, and not an American!

Now it is to reverse this situation, that the Community Church movement has come into being. It seeks the unity of men in the field of the spirit, by offerng the interests and ideals of the common life as the center of religion. This means, for the first time in church history, the definite elimination of theology as the unit of spiritual integration, and the substitution therefor of the social vision. To many people this seems to imply that to a sham conception of unity, we are deliberately planning to sacrifice the august rigors of truth. But no impression can be more mistaken! Under the community type of religious organization, men will differ just as widely and hotly in theological issues as they do to-day under the sectarian type of organization. But they will differ not in separate and competitive churches, but inside the one all-inclusive church, as scientists differ inside the one scientific society and citizens differ inside the one common country. The *Continent* has the right idea when it speaks, in the text quoted at the beginning of this editorial, of the day when all the Protestant denominations will be "fused into unity by one hot passion for Christ." "Even in that ideal day," it continues, "men will still disagree in many questions of church constitution and doctrine, and so a certain amount of technical denominationalism may survive. *But it will not be separative denominationalism!*" Here is the whole point! Differences will not mean separation.

We believe that the community church is the only church which can bring in this "ideal day," for the community church is the only church which offers a constructive substitution for the present unit of religious organization. Such a church when it comes —indeed, in so far as it has already come!—will hold within its folds all men of all minds on points of theological speculation; but there will be "no schism in the body." For in this church, as in the church of which St. Paul spoke, "by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

THE FIREPLACE.

I know of a place in the North Country
Studded with lakes full of trout,
And I sit by the fire this cold wintry day,
Thinking of summer up there.

I know of a lake in that North Country
And a spot in a cove where we swam,
And I sit by the fire this cold wintry day,
Thinking of summer up there.

Each summer we spent in the North Country,
Your mother and I in that shack,
And I sit by the fire this cold wintry day,
Thinking of summer up there.

She loved that spot in the North Country,
And made it so cozy for me
That I sit by the fire this cold wintry day
Thinking of summer up there.

Mother's gone, my boy, to the far Country,
But her spirit is always near—
When I sit by the fire on a cold wintry day
Thinking of summer up there,
Thinking of summer with her.

CHARLES RICE.

THE PULPIT

The Coming Revolution in Religion

A Sermon Preached by Rev. V. T. Pomeroy, B.A., in the City Temple, London

"The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner."—Mark xii. 10.

These words are a quotation from one of the Psalms, and we find them appended to the parable which tells how the tenants of a vineyard shamefully ill-treated, and even slew, the messengers sent by the owner of the vineyard, and at last slew the owner's son. It cannot very well be supposed that Jesus attached this quotation to his parable. This was done after Jesus was killed for telling the truth to the face of the religious and political magnates of his time. There are new and better reasons for quoting the words in this twentieth century. What those reasons are I shall try to make clear in the course of this sermon. But let me point out at once that the curious phrase, "head of the corner," describes the great stone that is at the foundation of the angle of a house. The stone thrown aside and neglected by the builders is nothing less than that upon which any safe structure must rest.

I think no open-eyed and thoughtful person can fail to see that the civilized world is anxiously awaiting a renewal of religion. It is not a restatement of theology that is wanted. We have had many and varied restatements of theology in recent years. The creed of Christianity has been patched and pruned; but the efforts and their effects have miserably failed to meet the real needs of the world. Many men, whose thought has been colored by modern scientific knowledge, have seen that the structure of Christian theology was not safe. They saw rotten beams; so they set to work and removed those beams from the historical building, and expected that the process of decay would be checked. But the mutilated building was no improvement and afforded no satisfying dwelling place for humanely religious minds. And today many people are sick of the very word theology. There were those who defended the whole creed of Christianity in its ancient forms and engaged in bitter battle against the renovators. But their numbers have grown fewer; excitement has subsided; and now, if theological Christianity is not an uninhabited ruin like some ancient English abbey, it is a dangerously tottering structure, weakened rather than strengthened, spoiled rather than beautified, by the removals and patchings which have been made in it.

In the period immediately before the war it was believed by many that if only theology was brought up to date, was translated into fresher, brighter speech, the Christian religion would irresistibly draw the common people. The working people, and also many in all grades of society, were supposed to be hostile or apathetic to Christian organizations because the creeds were old-fashioned in their language. So various items of the Christian creed were retranslated and modified. New explanations of hell, sin, atonement, and the person of Christ were set forth, as it was claimed, in terms of the modern mind. Some old dogmas were denied altogether—such as Adam's cursed apple and everlasting punishment. But the remaining fabric of Christianity proved no more inviting. The restatements failed to captivate the large numbers of people who were said to be too intelligent to attend church. And it seemed that the more you gave up, the less you pleased those who were somehow untouched by the older and entire forms of faith.

Then the crash of the war came and all that has amazed us during these last years; and surely it has become more apparent than ever that something is wrong—dangerously wrong. I will not trim my conviction. *Conventional Christianity is not adequate to the crying needs of the world.* To an increasing company of keen moral reformers and of sage students of the affairs of the human spirit, it stands as a positive block, instead of a pushing inspiration on the road of progress.

I ask you to consider the Russian Revolution, which has been hailed as one of the most hopeful events in the whole history of mankind. Although that Revolution caused serious embarrassment on the side of the military situation, who among us was not thrilled by a rushing joy? A soldier wrote to me from the front: "I was beginning to think God was dead; but then came the glorious news from Russia!" What part had organized religion in this great achievement of the Spirit of Man? What influence had the recognized religion of Russia? I say the Revolution came, not prompted and guided by the Christian Church or Christian belief, but in spite of these. Christianity has not been gratefully mentioned in this connection, has it? No one has thought of making such mention, or, if they have thought, they have not dared.

What, then, shall we expect in the near future? Will the wasting away of Christian theology continue until nothing is left, not one stone upon another? Or will there be a large and continuing return to the creeds of the Church? Some are looking to this latter possibility; but to me it is unimaginable. There may still be some temporary success in the practice of pouring new wine into old bottles; but, I believe the strain will not be withstood for long. The war and its attendant problems, the shames and sorrows of our time, have to my view, proved a further shattering blow at the edifice of orthodox belief. But these calamities and the tremendous demands with which they were charged have also crashed into the carefully reduced, nicely refined beliefs of those who in their day were called unorthodox by the majority. What are the things that remain, and what is their promise?

History does not give any support to the anticipation that mankind can give up definite religion and keep its life worth living. Religion has been a perpetual and inescapable factor in the history of man; although, too often, the accidentals have been mistaken for the essentials, just as if we were impressed by the truth of gravitation when a man fell down and were indifferent to its power in so far as multitudes walked safely along the city streets. I believe in "the everlasting reality of religion," as John Fiske called it; and, if for a time we were given up to great negations and petty rules, there would soon arise superstitions more unsatisfactory than the apparently discredited religion which I have named conventional Christianity. In 1793, at the time of the French Revolution, the Christian religion was officially repudiated in Paris. Many churches were turned into drinking saloons and dancing halls, and over the gate of the city cemetery the Chief of Police placed the words: "Death is an eternal sleep." Yet within a few months Robespierre spoke these words to his colleagues in Convention:

What could have induced you to tell people there is no God? Why does it seem good to you to prate to men that blind fate governs their destiny? Does the thought of annihilation bring to man purer and better feelings than the thought of his immortality? . . . I for my part cannot understand how Nature can fabricate falsehoods more useful to men than all truths. . . . And what have you to give in the place of the God you have thrown out of your churches? What have you to put in his place but chaos, nothingness, and death?

Will the time ever come when we shall do without religion, having instead a morality dictated by the State? If so, I fear that the future is dark. The old restraints being removed, the old reverence withering away, we shall enter upon a period of most dire confusion and unutterable pessimism worse in its devastation than even this atrocious war. There will be nothing strong and high enough to maintain harmony in society and hope in human hearts.

Surely never was such crying need for mankind to grip permanent realities. A bewildered groping world is looking for a steady beacon light. We can no longer be satisfied to steer by a flicker on the waves. A suspicion is gaining on us that our own smoke is hiding the great white light. The way to safety may be a change of mind far more heroic and radical than we have reached with our easy, superficial talk of repentance, personal and national. Theological reconstruction will not suffice. It only removes gargoyles and cleans away cobwebs and whitens the stones, when the very foundations are shaking. What we must have is religious reconstruction, a tremendous reversal, although the material used will include some which has had despised position in the old fabric. "The stone rejected by the builders will become the headstone of the corner." We must deliberately place our life upon a fresh foundation; act upon a new hypothesis; for it has become evident that what is wrong with the tottering house of conventional Christianity, with its counterpart in the society called Christendom, is that it is built too much on sand.

All that I have said so far about the increasing discredit of Conventional Christianity will seem to some wildly extravagant. They will feel that I have grossly overstated the case and have ignored the powerful influences which still emanate from Christianity for the elevation and welfare of mankind. They will say within their hearts, what is perfectly true, that millions have found comfort and encouragement in Christianity, that it has proved a saving and beautiful fact to numberless persons and homes, that it has on occasion sounded the clarion of social liberation, and that it has thrown open wide the gates of immortal life. Yes! all this I most gladly admit. Throughout the centuries of our era a singular spiritual life-force has transfigured an endless succession of individuals and, through them, has potently influenced the race of mankind. But in so far as persons have found true bliss, in so far as societies and nations have had their bonds broken by what is commonly called Christianity, it is due to the fact that Christianity has enclosed within itself the misunderstood, mistreated mind of Jesus, as a soul of freedom may be shut within prison walls and yet contrive to communicate by signals through barred windows in spite of the gaolers. We have thought the bright signals came from the gaolers because they lived in the prison, too, and held the keys. Really those signals came from their victim. *I solemnly charge Christianity with incarcerating, instead of forwarding, the original idea and personal spirit of Jesus.* For long enough it has upheld the very things he most detested; for long enough it has subordinated and crushed the very things to which he was devoted; so the Christian history can be truly described as *a continuous crucifixion of Jesus.* I declare he is the most maligned and misunderstood character ever born of woman, misunderstood by none so much as by those who claim supremely to understand him; maligned by none so much as by those who most readily call him: "Lord! Lord!":—

Our Master is the Christ, the Lord,
Unsought, unfollowed, yet adored;
In his dear name we preach and pray,
In his dear name we rob and slay.

In strife embittered we debate
All questions of his life's estate,
And was he God or man of earth?
And what the manner of his birth?

All things for him we will fulfil,
Save to the dictates of his will;
He is our Master and our Lord—
Rejected, worshipped, crowned, ignored.

This grave contention will become clear if you will consider how we have prized the documents called the Four Gospels. We have prized them with good reason; for they enshrine the purest, most glorious truths ever given to a purblind world, and there breathes in them still the spirit of him who was true Son of God and, therefore, true brother of every man. We are terribly fascinated by the Sermon on the Mount. At all events, we have been busy during the last few years in trying to explain it away and make it a less pointed reproach to the duties which the existing civilization called Christendom has put upon us. It haunts us, disturbs us. It is almost like the place of his crime is to a murderer; he cannot help going back there. And this serene strong person who moves through the mist of the Gospels, and whose form and face become so clear and wonderful in certain incidents narrated, still moves our hearts to admiration approaching awe. And the crucifixion draws our gaze, and, in spite of the fact that we are constantly being told that we ought to be only joyful at the foot of the cross, we cannot restrain our wondering tears. And as we contemplate the unmeasured sufferings of this present time we cannot help speaking of them in terms of that Cross upon a hill which stood bearing an agonized human body and brave, mournful heart long ago. It is almost as if we dimly realized that we are still keeping him there by our manner of treating one another, by the ideas which we follow, and by the stale customs we accept.

But what has that sermon, those stories, and the crucifixion, with their weird and inescapable fascination, to do with conventional Christianity? Take the Sermon. Deeply understood and in its original power, would it be allowed in a pulpit today? Let the answer be that before the war men were put in prison for propagating quotations from it, and since the war there has been ordered the confiscation of the rather out-of-date book by a bishop, expounding the Sermon on the Mount. Of course, having withdrawn the explosive, we beat the empty, shining case on Sundays. It softly chimes: "Little children, love one another." It is not sharp enough to annoy Cæsar.

Take the Stories. Here is one. They dragged a woman to Jesus. She had, they said, been caught in the very act of sin. Jesus said in effect: "Then you caught *two.* Where is the man? *You* are men. Why

did you not also bring him?" With our periodical campaigns of morality have we answered the question yet?

Jesus sat under the roof of a tax-gatherer. He significantly told his host that salvation had entered the door at about the same moment as he vowed to make restitution of ill-gotten gains. Is that the sort of conversion for which missions are designed? Are we being taught that it is God's truth, which cannot be juggled away, that values made by the community can only be appropriated by an individual by legalized theft.

Jesus was bitterly attacked for breaking the Sabbath by plucking ears of corn. Men high in the favor of the Church have recently hinted that the bad weather of the springtime was due to God's disapproval of people digging their gardens on a Sunday afternoon. And workers in the great, grim cities of the North, where for a quarter of a century some factories have been running seven days a week under a system only most mildly rebuked by the Church—these workers only grin and spit out bad words.

Jesus incurred suspicion by consorting with disreputable folk—thieves and harlots. We cannot consort with recognized thieves. For one thing, most of them are locked up. And for the other sort of sinner we have our tracts and homes. You cannot imagine a minister, as I am, going undisguised into a public house, not to preach, but to take my sober share of the poor companionship. It would really be too risky! I might be seen! Do I not remember that some years ago there was an outcry when one, who stood often where I now stand, had supper with some actors and actresses? It was a palpable indiscretion! Such carelessness is worldly—the particular world we have to draw apart from to preserve unspotted the skin of our souls; not the great world whose machinery of power will hurry you to execution on a cross, or to an equivalent penalty, if you do not keep silent about its iniquity.

Consider the crucifixion. Can anything be more heart-moving than that death at hands of cunning violence? It is still the theme of poets and artists. If you really think about it, your eyes will be wet with tears and then be dried by a flame. It is undeniable that Jesus was crucified for certain "reasons" in the minds of priests and potentates. Most of us think, having been taught so to think, that the people had a big hand in it; indeed, that the people gave the mandate. It is not true. *It is not true.* Paid agitators there were, no doubt. A conspiracy of legalized force always knows where to pick up a few miserable men who will yell "Crucify him!" at the right moment. If the event was so popular, why the hurry and the spring in the dark? "O most wicked speed!" The crime was practically completed in a single night. Has it not always been so? When the people are sleeping their lover is struck down and their salvation is stolen from them. It has even crept into the written narrative that those who had the villainous business in hand feared an "uproar of the people," although for nineteen centuries nobody has carefully weighed that fact and drawn the conclusion.

Jesus met a treacherous death because he had antagonized certain interests by what he proposed and by the purpose of his spirit. They did not crucify him to provide a subject for theologians. They crucified him *because they were afraid of him.* What did they fear? Great books have been written to explain why God required the death of that incredibly lofty life in its youth; but what has that to do with the fears and motives in the minds of priestly and imperial men? How does that help us to recognize and remove false religion, which obstructs the liberating truth of heaven, and unwarrantable power, which holds the multitudes in thrall? What were the fears of the mighty and what were the propositions which evoked them? Is there no longer need to answer that question? Have the factors which made up that situation of long ago been eliminated? Is the world now so happy in the enfranchisement of the children of a loving Father? Answer that question, and you will have dug to the foundation-stone of the religion which ere long will stand clear and call across the whole world to the dumb hopes of our humanity. And in its shade all the weary shall find rest, and in its light the nations shall have freedom. From ashes shall spring forth beauty, and the shackles on the body and soul of man shall become the garlands of joy.

If you have followed, I have put you in the track of a most startling fact. It will focus the religious thought of the future. Mingled in what we call Christianity are two ideas, two philosophies. One a medley; the other the expressions of a consistent mind and the secret of a life. The one is confounding and neutralizing the other. The one has to its account the tragic moral failure of the present; the other has not yet been intelligently and consciously adopted. The one, which is conventional Christianity, with its contending theologies and their counterpart in the disunion and woe of the peoples, is DOOMED: the other, the philosophy of Jesus, the purpose of his heart, the power of his Living Spirit, is the promise of the world's deliverance. This must be put first; let all else fall into place behind. We are drawing near the point of a great reversal, a sublime restitution, a revolution which will at last save the world from the recurring crimes which break our hearts and blaspheme our God. We have thought we were adoring Jesus when we have bowed to his image graven by our logic. But all the time his face of living flesh and love has been watching for us from behind the dungeon bars. For nineteen centuries we have tried the religion of what others said about him. Now strikes the hour for us to try the religion of what he said about us and the universe.

"Not everyone who says to me 'Master! Master!' will enter the Kingdom of Heaven: but only those who are obedient to my Father in heaven. Many will say to me 'Master! Master! have we not prophesied by thy name, and by thy name expelled demons, and by thy name performed many mighty works?' And then will I tell them plainly: 'I never knew you'. . . . Everyone, who hears these teachings of mine and acts upon them, will be found to resemble a wise man who builds his house upon the rock."

FOR A BIRTHDAY.

And still the years attain,—but Time, the Grinder,—
Finds the blade—thy Mind—more keen,
More fit, after each yearly turning
Of his sharpening wheel!

Nov. 14, 1914. A. A. O.

I will not kill or hunt any living creature needlessly, nor destroy any beautiful thing, but will strive to save and comfort gentle life and guard and perfect all natural beauty upon the earth. —*John Ruskin.*

CONTRIBUTED

Gandhi and the Prohibition Movement in India

Until very recently the consumption of liquor in India has been on the increase. Rev. Herbert Anderson in an article published in the *Bengalee,* Calcuttta, shows that the number of persons convicted for drunkenness in Calcutta for the last few years is as follows:

For the year 1915-16, 6,321; 1916-17, 6,752; 1917-18, 8,846; 1918-19, 7,685; 1919-20, 7,928. But India is the most hopeful country in the world for Prohibition. It is for this reason the man who is dubbed by the friends of liquor "Pussy-foot" Johnson, is on his way to India and will arrive there about the first of August to help those who are working the cause of Prohibition.

The reason for this hopeful outlook lies in the fact that Mahatma Gandhi, the leader of *Swaraj*—the Independent Movement of India—is leading the Prohibition forces in India with unprecedented success. One of the creeds of his unique movement for Indian freedom is that the Indian people must purify themselves from all evil habits, and above all the drink habit, and the mass of the Indian people are following him! Hundreds of liquor shops are being closed because the people will not buy liquor, and the students have organized themselves in big cities to give milk free of charge to those who wish to go to the liquor shop for intoxicating drink.

The government of British India is opposed to Prohibition because it derives a revenue of 170,000,000 rupees (which is one-third of the provincial revenue), that is about $50,000,000 from its excise department, and enforcement of total prohibition means loss of this enormous sum.

Gandhi in his magazine, *Young India,* June 8, 1921, in his appeal to the Moderates of India, pleads for prohibition in the following way:

> The state does not cater to the vices of its people. We do not regulate or license houses of ill fame. We do not provide facilities for thieves to indulge their propensity of thieving. I hold drink to be more damnable than thieving and perhaps prostitution. Is it not often the parent of both? I ask you to join the country in sweeping out of existence the drink revenue and abolishing the liquor-shops. Many liquor sellers would gladly close their shops, if the money paid by them (for licenses) were refunded.

Against this argument of loss of revenue, *Young India* publishes the following sound and convincing argument that the loss of the revenue will not be a real loss at all, but it will be a national gain to its wealth and moral welfare, and therefore the State—if it is for the benefit of the people—will be benefited by the introduction of prohibition in India.

> By abolishing excise, the nation will have on its hands the money it now spends on drink. The Government derives a revenue of 17 crores of rupees (about fifty million dollars), but the nation spends at least 50 crores (about one hundred and fifty million dollars) on drink. The most of the amount goes out of the country on foreign liquor and spent for things unproductive of any social good. The nation can spend the money or save it. If it saves this huge amount annually, the government will be able to tax the people accordingly. . . . Suppose the nation, instead of saving this money, spends it say on cloth, it will mean more growing of cotton, more manufacture of cloth, more employment and higher wages for the labor. Here again the nation will prosper. Why excise fails as a proper means of taxation is—*not to speak of sin of it—because it accelerates the increasing poverty and chronic starvation of the people.* As a doctrine, it is fallacious and unsound; as a policy it is ruinous and immoral. If this evil takes permanent root among the people, the Government will soon learn to its cost, like the man in the fable, that it has killed the goose that laid the golden eggs.—*The Young India,* June 1, 1921.

The Prohibition Movement is known in India as "The National Purification" and is intended by Gandhi to make the people more worthy to carry on their struggle for independence. The whole world is indebted to American women, particularly the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, for helping to bring Prohibition in America. Will they not help India, Mahatma Gandhi, and three hundred and fifteen millions of people to free themselves from the monster of the drink habit fostered and encouraged by the government of British India under the pretext of raising revenue?

TARAKNATH DAS,
National Executive Secretary,
Friends of Freedom for India.

A Burial at Sunset

Death is a sunset: and if in old age, with life's work done, and life's full day at its natural close, how beautiful a sunset it is! It is like the falling of leaves in the autumn, or the ripening of corn.

I shall never forget a sunset funeral. It was of an old man whose rich life had been rounded out to eighty years and beyond. The lovely spot in the cemetery where we gathered for the burial was on a hillside looking to the west, where the sun in a peaceful, golden sky was slowly sinking to his rest. All present felt how impressive was the double scene—two suns going down! Yonder Nature's Sunset! Here Life's Sunset! Which was the more beautiful? All the words spoken were of affection for him who had gone; of thankfulness that his life, so full of truth and honor and kindness, had been so long; of sacred memories of those four score years; and of perfect trust in the Infinite Love and Care that had always been over him, and would be over him forever.

As the service ended and the benediction was pronounced, the great orb of day sank in silence and beauty behind the western hills. Then, as the "peace of God" brooded over all, and we remembered that "after every sunsetting comes a sunrising," we turned away, not to say "Farewell," but, instead, "Dear Friend. Good Night! We shall meet in the Morning."

J. T. SUNDERLAND.

IN THE STREET.

The dazzling sunlight dances in the street,
Along the highway light and shadows play,
And little children come to greet the day
And join the festal dance with nimble feet.
When lo! around the curve comes, demon fleet,
A car! And since no mortal life indeed,
Can cope with cruel power, mad for speed,
A little child lies dead upon the street.

O Man! Is Traffic's mood but to destroy?
Is Commerce of such price that you should pay
No heed to little children at their play?
Defiant of life's dearest earthly joy?
If speed indeed must be so senseless wild,
Yourself, yourself destroy, but save the child.

MARION MURDOCH.

CORRESPONDENCE

A Letter from Bulgaria

[The following letter from P. M. Matthieff, a leading Bulgarian scholar, once minister to Greece and later director of Red Cross work, we are sure will be of interest. Dr. Jordan says: "Bulgaria has suffered very much—and except for her foxy king, put over her by the powers—on the whole unjustly."—EDS.]

Sofia, Bulgaria, June 19, 1921.

Dear President,

David Starr Jordan.

Professor Will S. Monroe has vividly reminded me of your visit to Sofia. I remember your reading me an illustrated magazine with some photos you had taken of refugees and traces of the destructive Balkan wars in Thrace. I have often regretted not to have preserved your address and I did not know that you continued your interest in the destiny of the peoples of these lands. I learn from Professor Monroe, who is unhappily detained in Samokov, that you earnestly desire and are willing to co-operate for a just settlement of the Balkan Peninsula, and that you have gone to the extent of drawing the attention of Secretary Hughes and even of President Harding to this subject.

I am indeed very happy to know this and so are my friends who remember meeting you in Sofia.

We Bulgarians are very unhappy, very unfortunate. We have mismanaged dreadfully, but guilty we are not. Our neighbors have taken advantage of our mistakes, of our own confidence in our right and have succeeded in their campaigns of calumny and falsehood to nigh destroy us. We, the Bulgarians, the leading nation in the Balkans, in the past, as also only lately, are now the pariahs in these Bulgarian lands. What with the occupation of our country, after the armistice, and the Reparation Commission sitting now in Sofia, not to speak of the cutting up of our country and parcels of it thrown to our neighbors as bones to dogs, we no longer feel at home. The putting in force of the Neully treaty has taken from us our independence and has placed us open to the caprices of our envious, revengeful enemies. We are disarmed, our finances are under the complete control of the Commission for the Reparation and so are our laws. Our neighbors are constantly accusing us of fomenting revolution within their new territories, of unwillingness to execute the peace conditions as if we dared even thinking of such conduct!

From what Prof. Monroe has told me you should be well informed on this painful subject and I would be going into details of which you are probably familiar, should I continue on this line.

We are doing what we can, we are bearing up against adversity, against odds. The struggle is severe, and alas! with like promise in the distance. But as long as there is life there is hope. Our hope is in the mistakes, in the unworthiness of which our neighbors are every day giving proof. Not one of our neighbors can conscienciously be proud of conquest, their extension with Bulgarian lands. We led them against the common enemy and secured victory, we swept them off the field, every one, from the contested territories in the last war. Yet the *glory* is theirs!

But on another question or subject. We have restarted the *English-Speaking League of Sofia.* Enclosed is a copy of the constitution. We have some two hundred members. England, which had formerly supported us in our development, has turned out to be our worst enemy. So far England has proved herself the most intolerant as to concessions to Bulgaria. France, after the armistice, came into Bulgaria as a bitter and revengeful enemy, she is now our friend, has liberated Bulgarian property. England continues to refuse to do likewise!

We have had poor success in England trying to obtain support for *The League,* even as regards books for its library. We have had better success in America, whence we have already received some three hundred volumes, and Mr. L. H. Bridgman of *The Standard Union,* Brooklyn, advises us of a considerable quantity about to be shipped. Then books are presents from various friends and sympathizers. Prof. Monroe has promised some as soon as he gets home. All such presents for *The League* are sent to Mr. Bridgman, who has them stored until they can be shipped on a Standard Oil tanker, bound for a Bulgarian port. Should you or any of your friends be able to spare books for the library of *The League,* such may be sent to Mr. Bridgman, who will take charge of them. Our library is in the formation stage and all kind of books are welcome. My object for speaking of this *League* is to show you that notwithstanding our bitterness against England, we are not so blind as not to see that if help comes from anywhere it must be from England, therefore, we the organizers of the League, are endeavoring to push it forward and through it secure some attention, sympathy. No such institution exists among our neighbors. England after all is the power in Europe for good or evil. France is more or less dependent upon England. There is no doubt that success so far as the *League* is concerned is due to American education. The American colleges in Constantinople and in Samokov, in Bulgaria, are responsible for so many speaking English in this country. In speaking of our inspections from England, I must say that we do not undervalue those from the United States. These are, however, less understood.

America is further off and her position is very complicated in European affairs, and undefined. It looks as if accident alone may bring America into European affairs for real good. Such an eventuality, however, is not lost sight of. But our friends in America are so few! In England we are better off, but the voice of these friends is a voice in the desert. However, this number is growing, as the Greeks and their *small* allies give more and more proofs of their bad qualities.

It is most extraordinary that concessions are sought to be made to Turkey, a people which has been condemned for generations as unfit even to rule itself, but none are thought of as regards Bulgaria!

Selfish policy is the idol set up by the victors in the war. And the United States, we think, is not the least responsible for this state of things. The United States was and is the most independent power in the present complicated situation. Her wealth, her force secured victory, but she is standing aloof, looking on at results not to be justified! They, the United States, came into the war to crush German arrogance and to see that a basis of justice is established for all in the final settlement. They have seen to the execution of half their program only. The second half of the program, the nobler one, has been, so far, abandoned and the world is suffering, as it has never suffered before. Is there a chance of a conference in Washington of all

the belligerents? Such a possibility has been moved. England is the most recalcitrant against revision. America alone can bring her to her senses. Her utter failure with the Greeks may do so to some extent, but America certainly holds the whip end, and she has a duty to perform, a duty she fought for. It looks as if the world would have been better had Germany come out victorious. Such an idea may be preposterous for the present victors, but the question is there. Can one imagine a worse condition of things than the present one? I cannot say any good for our government. Men inexperienced and violent, but they are keeping the country together. It is the peasant against the townsman and economical conditions do not improve, but the people are at work and industrious, and patient. Everyone who comes to see us says so. Perhaps there is less discontent among us than among our neighbors, who should be enjoying the spoils of victory they never merited.

Do not blame us for going into the war on the side of the Central Powers. The Entente would give us nothing but vague promises. The Entente is responsible for our not joining it, and the party most responsible is Russia; her policy prevailed in the negotiations with Bulgaria before breaking off with her. I have prepared a long article on Russian policy in Bulgaria and intend to send it for publication to *The Current History Monthly,* or some other paper.

But I must stop or I'll weary you.

Your sincerely,

(Signed) P. M. MATTHIEFF.

P. S.—A couple of months ago Prof. Frank A. Golder of your University visited Sofia and obtained a large quantity of literature regarding the last and previous Balkan wars. I met him several times, and I know he went away well informed as to our and our neighbors' situations and relations. We are never tired of informing visitors and invite inquiries; this unfortunately we do only at home. There is something missing in our character; we are very poor, inefficient in our defence abroad and have suffered in consequence. Our enemies are more nimble with word and *money.* P. M. M.

Marshal Foch on Napoleon

Stanford University, Cal., August 2, 1921.

Dear UNITY:

In a recent letter Marshal Foch is quoted by *La Paix par le Droit* as follows:

("Napoleon a echoué parcequ'il oublia qu'un homme ne peut être Dieu, qu'au dessus de l'individu il y a la nation, qu'au dessus des hommes il y a de la morale, et que la guerre n'est pas le but suprême, au dessus d'elle il y a la paix.")

("Napoleon fell because he forgot that a man cannot be God, that above the individual is the nation, above man is righteousness and that war is not the supreme end—above it is peace.")

Sincerely yours,

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

VAGABONDS.

I am the Ancient Dispossessed, and He is the Sorrowful Lord Christ,
Wanderers over the world we go, the Disinherited Sacrificed;
Shelterless, hungry and cold we fare,
And our brothers see us and do not care!

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

THE BOOK TABLE

Concerning Latin America

Prof. George H. Blakeslee of Clark University has developed a series of interesting conferences upon international relations at the university. Each conference deals with the problems of a specific area or group of nations. The first one was held in 1909. Others followed for several years up to the time of the great war. They were then discontinued, but were revived in May, 1920, when three days of meetings took place relative to Mexico and the Caribbean Region. It was the seventh in the series and perhaps it yields to none in the importance of the problems considered and the importance of the addresses given. All shades of opinion were presented by men of varied views. There was ex-Ambassador Wilson making bitter attack upon the president of the same family name; there was Frederic R. Kellogg, official mouthpiece of the oil interests, presenting a skilful defense of their position, which deserved a handsome special fee; there were Carson, who thinks Mexico's future deepnds upon the Indian, and Esquivel Obregon, who thinks that only the *ilustrado* can solve the problem; there were James Lord fresh from the organization of Mexican labor, and Roger Babson with his demands for pious statesmen. The problems of the Caribbean Region were presented with equal ability and in equal diversity with those of Mexico. A curious feature of the Conference, though not peculiar to it, was that few of the speakers stay to hear the other fellows. They glided into Worcester, said their say, and glided out again. But the university, and the town, and some non-rhetorical delegates from one and another institution, furnished a constituency that sat, and listened, and applauded with equal fervor the most contradictory utterances. The book before us* saves all this energy and rhetoric from oblivion. The addresses are here presented in full, as they were given, and can here be consulted and studied. Probably the most able address, the one showing most study and preparation, was Prof. Shepherd's on *The Caribbean Policy of the United States.* It was, however, an unwarranted surrender of principle. It may be that in our policy in the Caribbean we are merely carrying out an inevitable course of events; that is no reason why we should withhold the cry of protest—protest for our aggression, protest against injustice, protest in favor of the rights of the weak. It may be that wrongs must come; our voice may not stem a movement; but the voice should be raised just the same. There are twenty-three articles brought together in the book; they deserve a thoughtful reading.

One of the most important discussions of Mexican affairs is an essay by nine prominent Mexicans,† who are now exiles in this country. One of the writers has been a provisional president of Mexico, another was ambassador to the United States, several of them have been members of the cabinet, all of them are men of real significance, whose opinions carry weight and are entitled to consideration. They are men who have been chastened through hardships and who have

* Mexico and the Caribbean: Clark University. Addresses. Edited by George H. Blakeslee, New York: 1920. G. E. Stechert & Company. 8vo. pp. x. 363.

† Essay on the Reconstruction of Mexico. Manuel Calero and others. New York: 1920. 8vo. pp. 108.

had time, in a foreign land, to think upon the causes that have shipwrecked their work; they can see their mistakes and errors of judgment as they look back over the past. They address their essay (written originally in Spanish) to their fellow-citizens. It is not the work of one man but a rather carefully considered harmonization of views that were to some extent divergent. It is a conservative document. Though one or another was associated with Madero's government, none of the authors has ever been associated with any radical movement; some of them are, by nature, reactionaries. The suggestions they make are, for the most part, sane and practical. If these same men had earnestly attempted to put these same principles into operation, when they were leaders and in positions of commanding influence, it would have been a happy thing for Mexico. They state the fundamental proposition: "that neither the most conscientious surveys nor the wisest laws can solve our social problems unless the work be done on the solid foundation of the integrity in office." This is surely good, but how many cabinet ministers during the last thirty years in Mexico have applied the principle? They urge that constitutional changes should be effected by *constitutional means* (this in black letters); if they had said this with equal force when they were in power, perhaps they might have been heard. Our authors seem to agree that the constitution of 1917 should be abandoned and they advocate a return to the constitution of 1857, making such amendments to it as may be necessary. Is it not more rational to accept the constitution in force (that of 1917) and to amend it as experience may show desirable, *by constitutional means?* Carefully and thoughtfully our authors take up the various problems and elements in the Mexican situation one by one and present a formulation of action for each. There is much that is good in their suggestions. No more valuable document could be submitted to the Mexican people for study. The Obregon government may well give it a careful consideration. It is not to be expected, nor is it to be desired, that it should be accepted and followed in every detail. There is much in it that is more natural to a group of legal minds, working in New York City, in touch with great material interests of our country, than to practical and progressive patriots dealing with local problems in Mexico. But this essay is a work of genuine patriotism, a serious grappling with the difficult elements of a serious situation. It is certainly brought into existence by a real desire to help their native land, Mexico, to realize her legitimate aspirations.

The Third Congress of the Pan-American Federation of Labor was held in the City of Mexico from January 10 to 18 of this year. Its official report‡ is interesting reading. We have watched the effort to introduce our labor ideas and methods into Latin America with some concern. Conditions in these lands are so different from our own, that we have been fearful of misfits and skeptical of results. The historical background, the social adjustment, the philosophy of life, the racial make-up of the laborer, all are so different, that the application of our solutions to the problems, say of Mexico, might be a disaster instead of a forward movement. The officers of the American Federation of Labor have, to some extent, recognized this difficulty. Samuel Gompers himself has said: "We never told them at any time . . . that they should try to do everything and conduct their movement just like ourselves. We told them that each national movement would have to be worked out by the workers in their respective countries in accordance with the best thoughts, views and experiences in that country." Just so far as this principle is actually recognized and practiced, will the value of the Federation be to Latin Americans. Samuel Gompers and James Lord were present at the meeting, the latter as Treasurer. There were regular delegates from Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Porto Rico, Salvador, Santo Domingo and the United States. The constitution of 1917, with specific recognition of the laborer and his rights, gives Mexico a position of exceptional importance in the labor movement of the world. That some of the constitutional provisions may be impracticable does not render the document less significant. How far its ideas can be put into practice remains to be seen: how far Federation of Labor methods are adoptable and adaptable experience will show. At all events the organization of the Pan-American Federation of Labor and its meeting in Mexico, where President and Cabinet are at least verbally committed to advanced views, are notable events. That the organization is in serious earnest is evident from its official action regarding Santo Domingo and Nicaragua. It looks as if the American Federation of Labor has accomplished more tangible results in favor of the unfortunate Republic of Santo Domingo than all other agencies. May it not cease in its good work until full justice is done to Nicaragua, Haiti and the other small lands to our south! May President Gompers too be correct in his feeling that the great organization that he represents will stand solidly against our intervention in the affairs of Mexico.

Nowhere does a more ardent patrotism blaze than in Cuba. Nowhere was the independence struggle more bravely waged, more persistently renewed after temporary suppression. The story of the revolutions of the beautiful island has been told repeatedly. In the book before us,** we find a series of biographical sketches of the Cuban leaders, great men of the past, who by deeds on the field of battle, by writings, by addresses, aided to free Cuba. Thirty-six leaders are considered, connected with all the phases of the struggle. The sketches are arranged in alphabetic order and each is preceded by a portrait drawn by Valderrama. The author of the book is Néstor Carbonell, a member of the Cuban National Academy of Arts and Sciences. He is Cuban through and through. He has already done a great service, literary and patriotic, in publishing and editing the *Cuban Library*, consisting of the writings and addresses of the most notable national leaders. To the ever-increasing number of readers who are interested in the things of Latin America and desire to read them in the original, Néstor Carbonell's new book will be convenient and useful.

There are, in Venezuela, two leading universities—the National University at Caracas and the University of the Andes, at Merida in the western part of the Republic. From time to time we have called at-

‡ Report of the Proceedings of the Third Congress of the Pan-American Federation of Labor. Washington: 1921. Pan-American Federation of Labor. 16mo. pp. 136.

** Proceres: Ensayos biográficos. Néstor Carbonell. Habana: 1919. 8vo. pp. 278.

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

AN OPPORTUNITY—WANTED a young woman to live in a University Professor's family, one willing to share in the family work and at the same time attend High School. It is desired that she be a lover of the out-of-doors and take an interest in two little girls, 11 and 7. Apply to J. M. Artman, Williams Bay, Wis.

A NEW IDEA OF CHURCH UNITY.

Thinking that the brief and incomplete publicity given his project to establish in a mountainous district of Pennsylvania a church adapted to the use of all denominations has resulted in readers forming an inadequate idea of the plan James R. Mellon, a banker of Pittsburgh, promoter of the idea, describes it in detail in the August number of *The New Era* magazine, official medium of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Mr. Mellon, who is a brother of A. W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, is a Presbyterian. He prefaces his article with the statement that the proposed Church in the Wilderness, as it is to be known, is not to be a spectacular affair, although he concedes that "it is some oddity to have a church in which all denominations will worship and be satisfied."

The edifice is to be located on the top of Laurel Hill Mountains, about seven miles from New Florence, on the Pennsylvania Railroad, west of Johnstown and eleven miles north of the old town of Ligonier, on the Lincoln Highway. The exact situation has not been determined, nor the elevation, but the building will be within half a mile of Mr. Mellon's residence, thereby making it accessible to practically all residents of the section. Mr. Mellon has had a country home, with several thousand acres of ground, on the mountain top in Fairfield Township, Westmoreland County, for twenty years.

"The location," he declares, "is composed of mountain farms, with families that have no chance to attend church, and the nearest churches are over to the west of the valley. When we have Catholic servants, we have taken them seven miles to New Florence, where they have a small church with services once a month; the other churches are far away and the farmers are not in a position to attend services. This results in their not attending any church. So, while we are there in the summer time at our home, we have had different services when we had a chance to secure a minister, and the various denominations would always attend; even the Catholic children and their parents would attend Sunday school without any objection.

"The idea I conceived was to have some place that the Catholics would agree with, also the Episcopalians, and this is the nature of the plan as near as I can describe it. I have at hand only the ground plans from the architect in Philadelphia. We have not decided on what the elevation should be. We want something of a quaint mountain architecture as they have in many of the countries abroad. The situation of the church is not really located yet, but it will be within one-half a mile of my residence, so that it will be accessible to any of the inhabitants.

"Imagine yourself sitting in a room 60x60 with seats; then, at one side in the middle is an opening about twenty feet wide where the pulpit should be. On the outside of this wall but within the building is a railroad track with three altars, the same as three cars; the middle one would be Protestant, for any denomination, that is, Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, United Presbyterian, or the like. Should it be a day for the Catholics, they too would designate the time of their service, this train would be moved along so that the Catholic altar would come in front of this opening where the altar should be. This altar has sliding lattice doors which are locked up by the priest and opened when he wishes to have services, and when his service is over he locks his altar up and goes away. What the Catholics desire is to have their own altar consecrated to their own use. There seems to be no objection to preaching from their consecrated altar to their members sitting in a public hall or church.

"Then should the Episcopalians desire to have services, their car would be run to the opening and the Catholic car run into a room which just fits it so that it would be entirely isolated and taken care of until they wished to use it again. In like manner, the Episcopal altar would have all the necessary equipment and could be locked up and moved into a recess after being locked up. But at all times, when neither the Catholic nor Episcopal services were being held, the Protestant pulpit would be visible in the church, where Sunday school services, also preaching of any denomination, could take place. Accommodations in this pulpit are to be provided for the Baptists, and a small lake in front of the church building could be used if they desired baptisms.

"The building would be of stone with windows of Gothic style set high in the wall, secure against vandalism.

"The church will be called the Church of the Wilderness. This name is given on account of the remoteness of the situation. There are thousands of acres back of the church several miles towards Johnstown, a region that has no roads, just the primeval forest. The location is in the most historical part of Westmoreland County and where the Indian troubles were the most severe from 1758 to 1763. Located along the Forbes route to the west, starting at Fort Ligonier, then Fort Palmer, which is just opposite the site of the church, were Finley's Cabin, Fort Wallace, etc., on the trail into Pittsburgh. This valley was noted for its old furnaces in the beginning of the nineteenth century.

"The architect is Thomas M. Rodgers of Devon, Pa., who was the architect for the restoring of old Independence Hall some years ago. If labor can be had soon, the church will be built this summer."

JAPANESE OFFICE GIRLS FORM A UNION.

Twenty years ago such a thing as a girl working in a mercantile office or in a branch of the public service was wholly unknown. Today there are as least a million girls in Japan who are employed in post offices, banks, railroad offices, schools, telephone and telegraph offices, etc.

Now, with the advent of a democratic spirit, these working maidens of Nippon have discovered a great truth—that labor is "sacred." Since it is "sacred" it ought to enjoy a better remuneration. With this simple logic, the working girls of Tokyo formed a "union," with the avowed purpose of a collective strike, should their employers ever assume an attitude of treating them as anything other than the "guardians of sacred labor."

[Sent by Lucia Ames Mead from *East and West News Bulletin.*]

---

tention to the writings of the Rector of the University of the Andes, Dr. Diego Carbonell. Still a young man, physician by training, educated in Paris, he has been a leader of scientific thought in Venezuela. While his writings are exact and accurate, while he has had of course the rigid practical training of the clinic and the laboratory, his biological essays have had a true literary flavor and in thought and expression have made appeal to persons who have not had experience in observation and laboratory technique. Within a few weeks Dr. Carbonell has been appointed Venezuelan minister to Brazil; the University of the Andes suffers a serious loss by this appointment. While in Paris Carbonell published a study upon the epilepsy of the Liberator, Simon Bolivar. He has now printed a less extended study of the pathological nature of that other great South American leader, San Martin.*** It is the physical constitution and the maladies from which the great man suffered that are investigated. In the study regarding Bolivar, which involved the author in a bitter polemic, it was practically the question to what degree Bolivar's greatness and achievement were due to neuroses; in the present study, the author appears rather to investigate to what extent neuroses and diseases hampered accomplishment. The paper is, of course, in Spanish.

FREDERICK STARR.

***General Don José de San Martín. Diego Carbonell. Merida, Venezuela: 1920. 16mo. pp. 29.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- - - -